UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/564,493	01/12/2006	Zenton Goh	4276-101	9011	
	7590 05/12/200 AL PROPERTY / TEC	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 14329			RAJAN, KAI		
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709		21709	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3769		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/12/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/564,493	GOH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kai Rajan	3769	

	Kai Rajan	3769	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the Months of the Final Rejection. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further con</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c  NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11	l6 and 41.33(a)).		DTOL 204)
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed.</li> </ul>	·		,
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,6,7,9,30,32,34,35,37-42,47-55,57  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ided below or appended.	be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ul> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Michael C. Astorino/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3769	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Independent claims 1, 30, and 47 contain amendments that require further consideration and search. In particular, "body temperature" was not previously claimed in the independent or dependent claims. Remarks regarding independent claim 54 are presented below.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that, regarding independent claim 54, the applied prior art fails to disclose "the physiological parameter measuring device is adapted to be attached to the first person such that it is capable of measuring a physiological parameter when in contact with the abdomen of said person." The Examiner respecfully disagrees. It is submitted that the language "adapted to" and "capable of" are recitations of intended use, or functional language. As such, if the applied prior art teaches structure that is capable of performing the claimed function, then it meets the claim. In the instant case, at least the EKG sensors of Carlson et al. are attached to an individual via suction cups (Carlson et al. paragraph 0012). These sensors are capable of being attached to the abdomen of the individual and measuring signals from the abdomen. Furthermore, Carlson et al. teaches in paragraph 0011 that the sensors used in the system "can be disposed on any other body site, on which the . . . listed medical factors can be measured or determined. Therefore, the applied prior art is sufficient to reject the claims as presented.